

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-13 and 15-24 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 15 are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. Claims 5, 8 and 9 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in those claims. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 2, rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 10-13 and 15-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,185,857 to Rozmanith et al. (hereinafter "Rozmanith"). The Office Action, on page 6, rejects claims 3, 4, 6-9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozmanith in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,110 to Lektion et al. (hereinafter "Lektion"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action, on pages 2 and 3, asserts that Rozmanith teaches a data network method and apparatus with the features that are alleged to correspond to the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 1, 5 and 10.

The cancellation of claim 5 renders the rejection of this claim moot.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, claim 1 is amended to recite, among other features, detecting a pattern in the host response that matches the at least one defined pattern; determining that the detected pattern contains data; selecting a child pattern within the at least one defined pattern; determining whether the data contained in the detected pattern matches the child pattern; and outputting the data contained in the detected pattern of the host response in a format usable by the client based on the determined match with the child pattern.

Rozmanith does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, at least these features.

The analysis of the Office Action with respect to claim 10 fails for at least the following reasons.

Rozmanith does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, a host response parser, which retrieves the data from the host responses by comparing the host response with an expected data pattern, and when the host response matches the data pattern, retrieves the data from the host response and formats the data according to the matched pattern, as positively recited in claim 10.

The Office Action broadly asserts that Rozmanith teaches this feature at col. 10, lines 41-47. Rozmanith actually teaches a central host computer 14 for parsing data 41 and processing the database query 46 (col. 10, lines 41-50). Rozmanith further teaches that notebook PC 12 receives the packet from the host 14, parses the data and displays the data on the screen (col. 10, lines 56-64). As such, Rozmanith teaches that the host computer and/or the user computer manipulate the processing and parsing of the data. In Rozmanith, it is the host and/or the notebook PC that execute any alleged parsing and only parsing. Rozmanith, does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, the separately recited feature of a host response parser, which retrieves the data from the host responses by comparing the host response with an expected data pattern, and when the host response matches the data pattern, retrieves the data from the host response and formats the data according to the matched pattern, as recited in claim 10. As discussed above, Rozmanith teaches a host computer with the ability to parse data and a user computer with the ability to parse data. Claim 10 also recites a host computer and a client computer. Claim 10, however, additionally recites a host response parser which compares the host response, from the host, with an expected data pattern. It is unreasonable to assert that either of the host computer or

user computer in Rozmanith can be considered to correspond to a separate host response parser with all of the variously recited features in claim 10. As such, it is unreasonable to assert that Rozmanith anticipates the subject matter recited in claim 10.

The Office Action, on page 7, asserts that Rozmanith and Lektion in combination would have rendered obvious the combination of all of the features recited in independent claim 6.

Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, claim 6 is amended to depend from claim 7. Claim 7 is amended into independent form and recites a computer-readable storage medium, the storage medium storing a data file executable by a computer to cause a computer to execute a method, comprising the combination of all of the features recited in method claim 1. For the at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, the combination of features recited in claim 7 is not taught, nor would it have been suggested, by Rozmanith and Lektion, individually or in combination.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applied references cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features positively recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 10. Additionally, claims 2-4, 6, 11-13 and 15-24 are also not taught, nor would they have been suggested, by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-13 and 15-24 under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103(a) as being anticipated by, or unpatentable over, the applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-13 and 15-24 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Pardini
Registration No. 30,411

Christopher J. Wheeler
Registration No. 60,738

TJP:CJW/clf

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: December 4, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--